

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY  
REMARKS EN ROUTE TO BRUSSELS, BELGIUM  
MAY 23, 1994

Secretary Perry: Let me first of all set up some boundary conditions. I'm going to break this off in about 15 minutes or 20 minutes because I am going to get a few hours sleep tonight. I have a very busy day tomorrow. I will take about two minutes to give you a background of what I hope to do on this trip the next two days. First of all I want to deepen the relationships with the NATO Ministers of Defense. And that isn't done so much in the meeting it's done through bilaterals. And I have several very interesting bilateral meetings set up with some of the NATO Defense Ministers.

We're talking about issues of importance to us, not only at the meeting but issues that we had under discussion for some time now. So one of the big things you do at these meetings is develop your bilateral relationship with your Defense Ministers. Secondly, we want to successfully launch the relationships with the Ministers of Defense from the partnership countries. We've got 18 new members of the Partnership for Peace and 18 Ministers and their staffs are going to be here. I have arranged for a few bilaterals with them, it just was not enough time to do it with very many of them. And so I organized a reception Wednesday evening down at the SHAPE Headquarters and the whole purpose of that is to bring them together as a group and get a chance to talk to them off line for the meetings. I think that that is going to be very significant and a very worthwhile meeting.

In addition to that, I will have a very important emphasis on detailed series of discussions with the Russian Minister of Defense and with the Ukrainian Minister of Defense on a set of issues, some of which have to do with this meeting and others of which are not related to the meeting at all. For example, continuing our work with them in dismantling the nuclear weapons in those two countries. So I have substantial bilaterals planned with both Minister Radetsky and Minister Grachev. And then finally, the Minister of Defense of Kazakhstan, Mr. Nurmagambetov, spelling to be supplied, who was a hero of the Second World War. His battalion was the first one to the (inaudible) in 1945. He is celebrating his 70th birthday tomorrow and we are going to have a birthday party for him. I don't want to overlook that, he is a wonderful person. If you have the opportunity to get to meet him at that reception on Wednesday evening (inaudible). Nurmagambetov is a wonderful person and... just get him to talk a little bit about his WWII experiences. As you work backward from his age, you realize that when he led that battalion into the (inaudible) he was twenty-one and had been in the Army four years prior to that time. That's enough for background, now let me throw it open for questions.

Q: When you say you are going to have some very detailed meetings with the Russians, what are you looking for in terms of broadening the relationship with them? When they talk about asking for this special status, what is it that you're ready to work with them on?

A: I think that they will probably three issues in the discussions with Minister Grachev. First of all, I never meet with him without reviewing the nuclear dismantling programs

which we have underway with the Russians and Ukrainians, because he is a key to the success of that program. Secondly, it's quite possible that he will bring up with me the discussions that he has been having with Minister Radetsky on the division of the Black Sea Fleet. That issue may also be brought up by Minister Radetsky when I talk with him.

Because that is a bilateral issue between the Russians and Ukrainians and very often they come to us to discuss issues where they are having the problem between themselves, hoping that we might be able to assist in getting the problems resolved as we did for example in the trilateral summit meeting relative to the nuclear dismantlement in Ukraine. And then finally we may very well want to discuss the subject of the meeting which is the role of Russia with respect to NATO. There are two different aspects to that role. First of all, there is the Partnership for Peace. NATO has taken the position with which I concur, that there will be no special protocol for Russia as a member of the Partnership for Peace.

All Partnership for Peace members will follow the same rules. It is quite clear that Russia, just because of its size and its military capability has the potential for making a much greater contribution to the Partnership for Peace than any other country and we will encourage them to do that and I think that they will want to do that. In addition to the Partnership for Peace, NATO and Russia have other things which they need to be working at in a consolidative way. Part of that we will see tomorrow night when Grachev addresses the assembled NATO Defense Ministers and describes to them what Russia is doing in the way of military planning and that's something that will be a unique presentation, nothing like that has ever happened before and nothing like that is being planned for other non-NATO countries.

So there are aspects of this relationship which are very important and the other very obvious example to that is in the nuclear matters. Nuclear matters, in particular, counterproliferation. Both NATO and Russia have a very strong interest in actions that can reduce the threat of nuclear proliferation around the world. NATO and Russia will be discussing that aspect quite outside of the Partnership for Peace core.

Q: So are you saying that this presentation of Mr. Grachev goes beyond just symbolism?

A: The presentation that we understand that he is going to be making is describing the Russian military force planning. And it is an informational briefing. That's what going to be done tomorrow night. Now at the Partnership for Peace, pardon me the NACC meeting on the next day, we expect Mr. Grachev to be talking about Russia's interest in the Partnership for Peace. But we do not expect action on the Partnership for Peace at this meeting. That would be more appropriately done at the Ministerial meeting planned for next month.

Q: You use the term special protocol for Russia. Does that equate with status?

A: No. The protocol simply are the rules describing the requirements to join the Partnership for Peace. And the point is that each member that joins will have to follow the same rules. But each member also can make a proposal describing how that country will

participate in...what troops they will offer, what training they will participate in and Russia has the opportunity because of its size and military capability to propose many times more activities...commit many more troops than any other country possibly could.

Q: Would it have influence commensurate with what it would be able to offer in terms of troops that's what these other countries fear, do they not?

A: We will be...NATO has been very clear that no nation, no nation, will be granted veto status or authority over the partnerships. And we will assure all of the Partnership for Peace nations that no other nation will have a veto authority over that issue.

Q: Will these consultations that are you talking about be outside of the Partnership and what do you envision going on and how regularly?

A: Consultations dialogue I'm talking about will be outside the Partnership for Peace. Just as Grachev's presence at this NATO meeting tomorrow is outside the Partnership for Peace. They have not submitted a Partnership for Peace application, they are not in the Partnership for Peace at this time. He's being invited to speak to the Defense Ministers' meeting, not the meeting in which the other partnership members will be present. He will be for example, not invited to the reception Wednesday night because that's limited to nations who have signed up for the Partnership for Peace. So his meeting here and his dialogue here is a separate issue from the Partnership for Peace.

Q: What do you envision these consultations or this meeting or this dialogue? What kinds of subjects? Nuclear...?

A: Counterproliferation. Nuclear counterproliferation will certainly be one in which Russia brings something quite unique something very special to discussion. So that would be, certainly one very important area. There will be other issues concerning for example, let's just say the follow-on to the CFE treaty. Again, this is not a Partnership for Peace issue, this is an issue which was originally between NATO and Warsaw Pact. But now it's NATO and individual countries of which Russia is the most important. Those are big and important issues that will be very seriously discussed, but they are not part of partnership for peace.

Q: Do you have any feel based on your preliminary discussions between U.S. and Russian officials how far apart is what they want...is from what we are prepared to offer?

A: I expect to learn that in the next day or two but I do not at this time.

Q: Is there any doubt in your mind that Russia will become a partner?

A: I'll tell you what I know on that right now Steve, which is that Mr. Grachev has told me that he wants Russia to become a partner. Minister Kozyrev has told Secretary Christopher that he wants to become a partner. And we also know that the Duma, their Parliamentary body, has raised substantial objections to becoming a partner. Those are the

1398

4

ingredients of the stew. It's very difficult to forecast how the internal political dynamics are going to work out in Russia in the few months ahead. I have been expecting Russia to join the Partnership for Peace and I know that Mr. Grachev is also expecting to join the Partnership for Peace. We are not there yet and I do not want to make high confident forecasts.

Q: At a broader level could you explain why you think it is so important for the nations particularly Russia to join Partnership for Peace? At the end of the day what difference does it make?

A: I think there are two points of importance in there John. First of all, I think that it is vitally important that Russia be invited to join the Partnership for Peace. That they understand that this new institution is not intended to exclude them. It is intended to include them. We are not trying to draw new lines in Europe that keep Russia on the other side of that line. That's the first point. The second is that to the extent that this Partnership for Peace functions in a peace keeping role, Russia has a lot to bring to it. In terms of the number of troops they have, in terms of the quality of troops, training, and equipment they have. It would be a real asset to the Partnership for Peace were they to join it.

Q: Is there going to be any discussion of that joint exercise of the Army's this summer which has been on again off again?

A: Yes. I will discuss that in my bilateral meeting with Minister Grachev.

Q: Is it on again definitely?

A: I can answer that question better twenty-four hours from now after I have talked with the Minister. As far as we are concerned it is on. However, the decision is theirs and they are ...it has also like the Partnership for Peace, it has been criticized in their Duma. And so it's part of their internal political dynamics.

Q: Is there anything that you think that you have to offer and that NATO will offer Russia that will overcome objections in the Duma?

A: Relative to joining the Partnership for Peace? My opinion on that Susanne, is that the Partnership for Peace is so self-evidently in Russia's best interest to join. That I can not imagine, when the dust finally settles, that they would not choose to join it. As I see it, trying to look at it from their prospective, given that the Partnership for Peace exists and given that 18 other nations have joined it, there are only benefits to Russia in joining. The only way they can lose on it is by not joining. I think that will be the argument that will finally carry the day in Russia.

Q: Can you offer us anything new on North Korea?

A: There are not any significant new developments. Today, as I understand the reports we are getting, the removing of the rods continues at a deliberate pace. That those rods

and that that process continues to be, I should say that the IAEA continues to have oversight of that process and that they continue to report to us that there is no diversion of the rods taking place. So that is just a continuation of the reports that we have been getting now for the last several days.

There is another issue which you are probably aware of, not related to diversion of the rods, but related to some measurements which the IAEA wants to make on some of the rods, so they can determine more precisely what happened back in 1989. They wanted to discuss this with the North Korean Government, they agreed to have that discussion and the IAEA officials are on the way to Pyongyang for that discussion.

My understanding is that they are scheduled to reach Pyongyang tomorrow. But I want to make clear that that is on a separate issue, that on the issue on the inspection of the rods to determine what happened back in 1989. But in terms of the primary issue, which is assuring that no diversion is taken place, the information continues to be the same as it was for the last few days.

Q: How are things in Bosnia? There seems that there was some problem around Gorazde still?

A: There is no shelling of cities and no heavy fighting going on. Things seem to be never calm in Bosnia, so I would not describe them as calm.

Q: Evidently, the Serbs were reinforcing some positions that had been thought of as perhaps the U.N. wanted them to not to be there?

A: There was an agreement made by the Serbs to remove some of the troops, policemen as they call them, that they had them in the exclusion zone. And then at the last minute, that didn't happen, because of some dispute about what the Muslims have or have not done. So that (inaudible) is still going on, the issue is not resolved one way or the other yet.

Thank you: